



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,967	02/06/2002	Chris Bollerud	1001996-1	2370

7590 09/29/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2145

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/068,967

Applicant(s)

BOLLERUD, CHRIS

Examiner

Tanim Hossain

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Challenger (U.S. 2005/0028080).

As per claim 10, Challenger teaches a method of controlling content accessed by an end user within a shared content environment, the method comprising: receiving at least one content item from a content provider (0008); checking for description file information (0044, 0033); backfilling information within the description file if missing (0042, 0045); determining if the content item is valid (0044, 0045); copying the content item with an associated description file within an archive (0010); importing the description file to a content holding database (0044, 0045); and sending valid content to a holding zone (0036, 0037).

As per claim 11, Challenger teaches a method of providing error control of content accessed by an end user within a shared content environment, the method comprising: receiving at least one content item from a content provider with the intent of making available the content item to an end user (0044, 0045); validating the content item is error-free (0044, 0045); and

making the valid content item available to the content provider for access to the end-user (0044, 0045).

As per claim 12, Challenger further teaches that the validating step comprises cleansing the content item to ensure the content item and its search hierarchy are reliably linked (0044, 0045).

As per claim 13, Challenger further teaches that the validating step comprises archiving the content item (0010).

As per claim 14, Challenger further teaches that that validating step comprises: determining the hierarchy of the content item; and assigning the content item to the identified hierarchy (0044, 0045).

As per claim 15, Challenger further teaches that the validating step comprises checking meta-data associated with the content item is consistent with a previously defined format for the system (0044, 0045).

As per claim 16, Challenger further teaches moving the content item to an error zone upon lack of validation (0044, 0045).

As per claim 17, Challenger further teaches notifying the content provider that the content item failed validation (0044, 0045).

As per claim 18, Challenger further teaches maintaining a prior valid version of the content item for access by the user should the content item fail validation (0044, 0045).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger in view of Day (U.S. 2002/0194227).

As per claim 1, Challenger teaches a computerized content management system comprising: a receiving queue for receiving content (paragraph 0009); a content staging unit, coupled to the receiving queue, and including an operating system to validate the content for format consistency and verify its accuracy and process the content from a first format to a second format defined by the content management system (paragraphs 0008, 0037, 0038, 0044, 0045); and a content storage unit, coupled to the content staging unit, and including an operating system to receive the validated and verified content for use by an application utilized within a computerized content management system (paragraphs 0008, 0010). Challenger does not specifically teach the conversion from a first format to a second format defined by a data type dictionary. Day teaches the conversion of documents in a web-authoring program, such that conversions of the document take place, as required, using a data type dictionary (paragraphs 0003, 0018). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ability to convert documents based on a DTD, as taught by Day in the system of Challenger. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that it is advantageous to have

a common format for documents for the sake of simplicity in a web-authoring program. Both inventions are from the same field of endeavor, namely the efficient publication of data to be shared on the Internet.

As per claim 2, Challenger-Day further teaches that the content staging unit, while validating the content, further checks for description file information and provides such description file information, if missing (Challenger: 0044, 0045).

As per claim 3, Challenger-Day further teaches that the content staging unit provides identity of the description file after checking (Challenger: 0044, 0045).

As per claim 4, Challenger-Day further teaches that the content includes a content item having a search hierarchy and the staging unit cleanses the content item to ensure the content item and its search hierarchy are reliably linked (Challenger: 0024 – 0029).

As per claim 5, Challenger-Day further teaches that the content staging unit determines the search hierarchy of the content item and assigns the content item to the identified hierarchy (Challenger: 0044, 0045).

As per claim 6, Challenger-Day further teaches that the content staging unit checks whether meta-data associated with the content is consistent with a previously defined format for the system (Challenger: 0044, 0045).

As per claim 7, Challenger-Day further teaches comprising a content error zone, coupled to the content staging unit, to receive any content item failing validation (Challenger: 0044, 0045).

As per claim 8, Challenger-Day further teaches that the content staging unit notifies the content provider if the content failed validation (Challenger: 0044, 0045).

As per claim 9, Challenger-Day further teaches that the content staging unit maintains a prior valid version of the content for access by the user should the content fail validation (Challenger: 0036, 0037).

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed on July 17, 2006 have fully been considered.

a. Regarding Applicant's discussion of claim 1, a new ground of rejection has been applied.

b. With respect to claim 10, Applicant asserts that Challenger does not teach the "checking for description file information; backfilling information within the description file if missing; and determining if the content item is valid." Examiner respectfully disagrees. In paragraph 0033, Challenger teaches a template upon which alteration of the data takes place, if necessary. The template constitutes the description file information, which is manipulated to arrive at the final web document (0036; where the checking and modification takes place). Given that this is template is used to check the validity of the document itself, the checking for description file information is constituted, along with determining if the content item is valid. In paragraph 0042, Challenger discusses that in the event of a dangling reference within the template, the referenced object is generated to correct this issue. This constitutes the backfilling information within the description file information as claimed. Therefore, Challenger fully teaches the elements of claim 10.

c. As per claim 11, Challenger checks whether the content item is error-free throughout the invention. In paragraph 0008, Challenger discusses whether references have become obsolete, and discusses keeping up with the currency of referenced objects, in addition to broken links, and the like. Even so, the claimed limitation only discusses the validation that the content item is error-free. As such, the discussion of the DTD is irrelevant, and Challenger fully teaches validating that the content items are error-free as claimed.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tanim Hossain  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2145

  
JASON CARDONE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER